

with ramp wiping surfaces, since Buchter teaches ramp wiping surfaces 100 in front of contacts 74, 76, 78, as shown in Figure 2. Further, the official action states, that the ramp surfaces provides cleaning for portions of a contact of a mating connector prior to contact engagement. This statement of the official action demonstrates precisely the problem overcome in the prior art, and why claim 1 of the invention is patentable. The cited reference Buchter does not disclose that wiping provides for cleaning of a contact. The official action is the sole source for the proposition that wiping of contacts over surfaces 100 provides for contact cleaning. In fact, such reference discloses only deflection of the contacts by contact engagement with the surface 100, see column 7, lines 16-44. Applicant's own disclosure, at page 10, lines 24-31, points out that it is desired to avoid wiping of the contacts against insulative material of the housing, since such wiping would apply insulative material on the contacts and reduce conductivity undesireably. Accordingly, claim 1 recites, conductive surfaces on the contacts being rearward of the wiping surfaces and offset laterally of the wiping surfaces to engage unwiped surface areas of mating contacts of another, mating connector. This claim can not be rejected for the ground of rejection stated, since the prior art cited is irrelevant to the recited invention of Applicant, and the office action does not cite a reference that discusses contact cleaning.

With respect to claims 5 and 15, the Official Action states, "The use of power contacts in an electrical connector ... are old and well known in the art." This ground of rejection is respectively traversed, since these claims are not limited to a recital of "power contacts", but instead, recite power contacts in combination with signal contacts. This ground of rejection refers to no prior art disclosing this combination. Further, this

ground of rejection concludes erroneously that a claimed combination including power contacts is unpatentable. This ground of rejection provides no prior art guidance for one skilled to have concluded, that a combination including power contacts is unpatentable. Further no attention is directed to the features of the power contacts recited in these claims. The features speak for themselves, since no prior art is available that requires the features to be distinguished by argument.

Each of Claims 8 and 18 are separately patentable, and recites the wiping surfaces covering front tips of the contacts. In Buchter the contacts are in recesses, but are not covered.

Each of Claim 2, 6, 7, 12, 16 and 17 is separately patentable because, no reference or combination of references teaches wiping surfaces being offset laterally with respect to rearwardly located surfaces of contacts, and being interposed between such contacts and a front of a housing. In Buchter the surfaces of the contacts and the lifting surfaces 100 coextend when in alignment with one another, and are not offset laterally with respect to one another.

Each of Claims 3 and 13 is separately patentable for reciting wiping surfaces in alignment with edge margins of contacts and offset from conductive surface areas of the contacts. In Buchter the surfaces of the contacts and the lifting surfaces 100 coextend when in alignment with one another, and are not offset laterally with respect to one another.

Each of Claims 10 and 20 is separately patentable, since the contacts of the references are flat and without contact surfaces being raised with respect to edge margins.

Reconsideration is requested.

Charge Deposit Account Number 23-1950 \$74 for one additional independent claim in excess of three.

Respectfully submitted,

Wayne S. Davis  
Applicant



---

Gerald K. Kita  
Registration No. 24125  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Phone: (302) 633-2767

GKK/slf